

Quote Start

I would like to ask you if by your viewing "spending of their wealth" as conditional could then mean that in a society where women are the breadwinners, men would no longer be considered qawaamun ala nisaa?

Quote End

No, the men wouldn't be considered قَوَامُونَ عَلَى النِّسَاءِ, and explanation will be provided in:

Explanation below full verse of قَوَامُونَ عَلَى النِّسَاءِ الرِّجَالُ on this page

Quote Start

if qawaamun is premised on wealth that men spend on women, and the issue of two female witnesses is premised on greater financial knowledge of men over women- in the example of expertise you mentioned- then it follows that when men no longer have money, neither of these two verses are applicable. What do you think?

Quote End

Yes, it would apply to these verses and many other verses

It would apply to the verse of the witnesses for the reason I explained before, financial knowledge and value of testimony in that subject.

It would apply to the verse of:

الرِّجَالُ قَوَامُونَ عَلَى النِّسَاءِ بِمَا فَضَّلَ اللَّهُ بَعْضَهُمْ عَلَى بَعْضٍ وَبِمَا أَنْفَقُوا مِنْ أَمْوَالِهِمْ فَالصَّالِحَاتُ قَانِتَاتٌ حَافِظَاتٌ لِّلْغَيْبِ بِمَا حَفِظَ اللَّهُ وَاللَّاتِي تَخَافُونَ نُشُوزَهُنَّ فَعِظُوهُنَّ وَاهْجُرُوهُنَّ فِي الْمَضَاجِعِ وَاضْرِبُوهُنَّ فَإِنِ اطَّعْتَكُمْ فَلَا تَبْغُوا عَلَيْهِنَّ سَبِيلًا إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلِيمًا كَبِيرًا

It applies here because money leads to power and authority. If the woman was a doctor, and the man didn't have any job, the woman can easily divorce the man who's imposing on her, and leave the husband helpless, and she can live on independently. So she has the upper hand. At the same time, she has the responsibility and accountability for stuff that happens, and will bear the consequences of any events such as divorce since most or all the stuff in the house was bought with her money, and she has a say in how to deal with it (additional verses related to divorce and other examples are below).

Examples of some other verses rulings that would be affected:

وَلِلرِّجَالِ عَلَيْهِنَّ دَرَجَةٌ

In divorce, if the woman is the one who has the قوامة since she pays, then she has a bigger say in how things will go in the process of divorce, such as dividing of property etc. so وَلِلرِّجَالِ عَلَيْهِنَّ دَرَجَةٌ would no longer apply if قوامة was for the woman

أَسْكِنُوهُنَّ مِنْ حَيْثُ سَكَنْتُمْ مِنْ وُجْدِكُمْ وَلَا تُضَارُّوهُنَّ لِتُضَيِّقُوا عَلَيْهِنَّ وَإِنْ كُنَّ أُولَاتٍ حَمِلٍ فَلْيَضْحَكُوا عَلَيْهِنَّ حَتَّى يَضَعْنَ حَمْلَهُنَّ فَإِنْ أَرْضَعْنَ لَكُمْ فَآتُوهُنَّ أُجُورَهُنَّ وَأَتَمِرُوا بَيْنَكُمْ بِمَعْرُوفٍ وَإِنْ تَعَاسَرْتُمْ فَسَتْرُضْ لَهُ أُخْرَى

The husband will not be able to pay, and he doesn't own a house, etc. so this wouldn't apply. Some of these rulings (the ones that are possible to happen to the husband) can be switched around

Some inheritance rulings:

لِلذَّكَرِ مِثْلُ حَظِّ الْأُنثَيَيْنِ

Side note: arguing that just because it's a fardh on the man to provide, and no matter how rich the woman is she doesn't have to provide, proves that لِلذَّكَرِ مِثْلُ حَظِّ الْأُنثَيَيْنِ applies even when the woman is making the money and the man isn't, is a weak argument because:

- The claim that it's always fardh on the man to provide and women never need to provide, is baseless and illogical. Most of the times the man will do so, it's not a command.
- If the wife is a doctor, and the man doesn't have any degree, the wife doesn't have any right to just make money and not pay for shelter etc. and make the degreeless man work his butt off for little money while she sits back selfishly with her wealth. (In many cases these financial "if, thens" should have been settled before marriage took place)

I will emphasize that this is logical because inheritance is financially related, and قوامة is financially related, hence when قوامة role changes due to condition of مَوَالِيهِمْ, some rulings of inheritance are also subject to change.

Quote Start

Regarding the issue of consensus, it isn't entirely fake.

Quote End

Correct. I'm just against the idea as using consensus claims as an argument to establish a point or proof instead of relying solely on tackling the mere content argument from an intellectual perspective. Also, it's something very hard to prove, especially on some specific subjects. You can only reach certain levels of certainty with assumptions of consensus in some fields.

Quote Start

I don't agree with the deduction that this is because women had less knowledge of money

Quote End

If this isn't the reason (or if it isn't the main reason), then can you list all of the logical reasons why the portion of the verse below was mentioned?

فَرَجُلٌ وَامْرَأَتَانِ مِمَّنْ تَرْضَوْنَ مِنَ الشُّهَدَاءِ أَنْ تَضِلَّ إِحْدَاهُمَا فَتُذَكِّرَ إِحْدَاهُمَا الْأُخْرَىٰ

When you list the reasons, explain in detail why the reasons you presented are better than the reason I presented of it being linked to financial expertise, and also explain in detail why my financial expertise link argument is weak in general.

Quote Start

I can also use ayaat, to justify that for example by saying that the Qur'an states to release to the orphan (females) their wealth when you judge that they are by the age of maturity (to handle their own money) and if this was already the case then I cannot see why women would have been financially incapable. However, it is impossible for me to entirely ascertain what the condition of that society was.

Quote End

I think the verses you are referring to most likely refer to both genders of الْيَتَامَىٰ

وَأَتُوا الْيَتَامَىٰ أَمْوَالَهُمْ وَلَا تَتَبَدَّلُوا الْخَبِيثَ بِالطَّيِّبِ وَلَا تَأْكُلُوا أَمْوَالَهُمْ إِلَىٰ أَمْوَالِكُمْ إِنَّهُ كَانَ حُوبًا كَبِيرًا

وَابْتَغُوا الْيَتَامَىٰ حَتَّىٰ إِذَا بَلَغُوا النِّكَاحَ فَإِنْ آنَسْتُمْ مِنْهُمْ رُشْدًا فَادْفَعُوا إِلَيْهِمْ أَمْوَالَهُمْ

Quote Start

I maintain that these laws have to do with the intrinsic nature of men and women and is not premised on external factors. That's why I would have two female witnesses for one male witness regardless of how educated the women are.

Quote End

There are some laws that may be linked to the intrinsic nature of men and women, such as polygamy being allowed for men and not women, breastfeeding, physical protection in most cases (can be interpretation within *الرِّجَالُ قَوَّامُونَ عَلَى النِّسَاءِ* in verse of *يَا فَضَّلَ اللَّهُ بَعْضَهُمْ عَلَى بَعْضٍ*)

However, each case needs to be analyzed separately to see whether finances have a big link to the subject or not. All of the verses I talked about that have ruling changes have strong financial links. So for example the verse of witnesses in the verse of *مداينة* doesn't require any physical strength, there's only an intellectual significance linked to the number of witnesses, which is why even textually the Quran mentions

أَنْ تَضِلَّ إِحْدَاهُمَا فَتُذَكِّرَ إِحْدَاهُمَا الْأُخْرَى

So it would be a huge problem if we don't that this is due to financial link, because then this may lead to the assumption that women in general are deficient in testimony, which would contradict the Quran (other cases of witnesses have no gender specification) and logic (women aren't always deficient in testimony, and it's not even a general rule either). So since it's textually mentioned that *أَنْ تَضِلَّ إِحْدَاهُمَا* it's clear that the reason for more witnesses was that they are more likely to forget, and the only logical justification I have seen so far for this is the financial expertise link. (The opinion of the financial link can be found in *تفسير المنار* of *محمد رشيد رضا* of this ayah)

Quote Start

I would also believe that men are in general *qawamun ala nisaa*, even the man in the street who observes a woman being harassed and steps in to protect her. That has nothing to do with his wealth or anything.

Quote End

قوامة can be linked to physical strength in certain situations, however financial power has a stronger link to *قوامة* than any other trait because:

- 1) It's the only textually mentioned reason of قِوَامَة, the other was بِمَا فَضَّلَ اللَّهُ بَعْضَهُمْ عَلَى بَعْضٍ which doesn't mention specific reasons (that could include physical strength)
- 2) Financial power is much stronger than physical power. A billionaire can do much more than a buffed muscular dude, or Bruce Lee, or any form of physical strength.

Side note: there is no such thing as complete قِوَامَة in a marriage relationship (or there shouldn't be at least, in most cases). Marriage isn't a one-sided thing. So a male may have 80% قِوَامَة and the woman may have 20% depending on each situation. The affect financial support may have on قِوَامَة could arguably go beyond 50%, which could be one of the main reasons why Allah textually mentioned وَيَمَا أَنْفَقُوا مِنْ أَمْوَالِهِمْ when قِوَامَة was mentioned. The physical strength can have a 10% link to قِوَامَة for example

Remember that each situation is separate. We can generalize a قِوَامَة ruling 100% for men and 0% for women just because most men will have more physical strength. The case of a man protecting a woman or his wife from physical assault is completely separate than topics that have a bigger link to finance that have been talked about.

Quote Start

As for the specifics later in the verse it related to the punitive measures mentioned about "fearing disloyalty." That's what I think. Allah knows best.

Quote End

وَاللَّاتِي تَخَافُونَ نُشُورَهُنَّ

نُشُورَ here could be understood as a form of rebellion, and the steps taken when this happens requires a beyond 50% level of قِوَامَة, otherwise the male won't have the power to take such steps since the woman can just divorce him and he'll suffer more from it.